



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/823,531	03/31/2001	Mingte Chen	M-11528 US	7476

33031 7590 02/12/2004

CAMPBELL STEPHENSON ASCOLESE, LLP
4807 SPICEWOOD SPRINGS RD.
BLDG. 4, SUITE 201
AUSTIN, TX 78759

EXAMINER

BROSS, EDWARD J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2126

13

DATE MAILED: 02/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/823,531

Applicant(s)

CHEN ET AL.

Examiner

Edward Bross

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 13 and 17-101 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 13 and 17-101 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 6,7,9-12.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2126

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-10, 13, and 17-101 are pending in this application.
2. Applicant is required to update the status of all copending applications cited in the specification with patent # (see p. 1-2).

Specification

3. Claims 95-101 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. These claims are identical to claims 27-33.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 and 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2126

6. Claims 1-10 and 27-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skarbo (5,805,886).

7. As to claim 1, Skarbo teaches the invention substantially as claimed including:

obtaining an event communicated via an incoming communication channel (col. 5 lines 21-25) of a plurality of communication channels (Fig. 2), wherein each communication channel of the communication channels has a media type (100, 102, 104 Fig. 2),

at least two communication channels of the communication channels have

different media types (100, 102, 104 Fig. 2), and

the event corresponds to a work item available via the incoming communication channel (col. 5 lines 29-33);

providing notification of the work item via a user interface (col. 5 lines 29-33);

receiving an activation of a work item object of the user interface, the work item

object being associated with the work item (col. 5 lines 32-33); and

issuing a command associated with the activation of the work item object to an outgoing communication channel of the communication channels (col. 5 lines 43-45).

8. Skarbo does not explicitly disclose that a work item object is a work item. However, Skarbo discloses providing the selected or dialed destination identifier from the address book to the outgoing communication channel and this work item can activate user interface (col. 5 lines 44-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to encapsulate this information in a work item object because by putting it into an

Art Unit: 2126

object it will abstract this data in order to simplify support of different types of communication channels.

9. As to claim 2, Skarbo teaches:

the incoming communication channel and the outgoing communication channel are the same (col. 5 lines 34-45).

10. As to claim 3., Skarbo teaches:

performing the command, wherein the command is performed by the outgoing communication channel (col. 5 lines 44-45).

11. As to claim 4, Skarbo does not explicitly disclose providing the notification in real time with the obtaining of the event. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the notification in real time as any delay between the event and notification of the event that would be perceptible by the user of the system would decrease the utility of the system.

12. As to claim 5, Skarbo teaches:

providing the notification includes invoking a notification module of the user interface (col. 4 lines 19-22).

Art Unit: 2126

13. As to claims 6 and 7, Skarbo does not explicitly disclose the activation of the work item object is associated with an accept or release work item command. However, Skarbo discloses that the activation event then invokes the appropriate callbacks, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to associate the invoking of the appropriate callback with accepting the work item and releasing it from the list in order to give greater control over the actions taken when a work item is selected.

14. As to claim 8, Skarbo teaches that:

each communication channel of the communication channels is associated with a channel driver of a plurality of channel drivers, wherein each channel driver of the channel drivers is operable to issue an associated command to an associated communication channel (the applications in Figure 2 are necessarily the functional equivalent of the channel drivers); and

the issuing command comprises:

determining the command channel driver with the associated command corresponding to the command (col. 6 lines 59-63); and

sending the command to the command channel driver, wherein the command channel driver is operable to issue the command to the associated communication channel, the associated communication channel corresponding to the outgoing communication channel (col. 7 lines 5-8).

15. As to claim 9, Skarbo teaches:

sending the command to the command channel driver comprises obtaining the command from the user interface by a communication server, wherein the communication server sends the command to the command channel driver (col. 7 lines 9-14).

16. As to claim 10, Skarbo teaches:

each communication channel of the plurality of communication channels is associated with an associated channel driver (the applications in Figure 2 are necessarily the functional equivalent of the channel drivers); and

the issuing the command comprises sending the command to the associated channel driver for the incoming communication channel, wherein the associated channel driver performs the issuing of the command to the incoming communication channel (col. 7 lines 5-8), the incoming communication channel and the outgoing communication channel being the same (col. 5 lines 34-45).

17. As to claim 27, Skarbo teaches:

the activation of the work item object is associated with selecting one communication channel of the plurality of communication channels for working on the work item (col. 6 lines 56-59).

18. As to claim 28, Skarbo teaches:

the activation of the work item object is associated with selecting from a list of a plurality

of work items (col. 4 lines 64-68).

19. As to claim 29-31, Skarbo does not explicitly disclose the activation of the work item object is associated with one of a suspend work item command, retrieve work item command, initiate work item command, blind transfer of work item command, consultative transfer of a work item command, or a conference command. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Skarbo's system to allow the suspension, retrieval, and transfer of work items to provide fine control over the management of tasks that are activated.

20. As to claim 32, Skarbo teaches:
the user interface comprises a plurality of user interfaces (120, 122 Fig. 2), wherein
each user interface of the user interfaces is associated with an agent of a
plurality of agents (110 Fig. 2); and
determining which one agent of the agents to be notified of the event, wherein the
providing the notification comprises providing the notification to the one agent
via the user interface associated with the one agent (col. 5 lines 26-28).

21. As to claim 33, Skarbo teaches:
the issuing the command comprises determining the command to be issued from a
context of the work item object when the work item object is activated (col. 6
lines 59-63).

22. Claims 54, 55, and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Selby (5,555,365).
23. As to claim 54, Selby teaches the invention as claimed including:
an object table, wherein the object table comprises information regarding a user interface object (col. 2 lines 49-53).
24. As to claim 55, Selby teaches:
the object table further comprises information regarding an action to be performed when the user interface object is activated (dependency function Fig. 5).
25. As to claim 58, Selby teaches:
the object table further comprises a notification object (the resource ID and attribute name Fig. 5).
26. Claims 56 and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Selby (5,555,365) in view of Skarbo (5,805,886).
27. As to claim 56, Selby does not teach the action comprises issuing a command to a communication channel. Skarbo teaches issuing a command to a communication channel (col. 5 lines 43-45).

Art Unit: 2126

28. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Selby and Skarbo because Skarbo's issuing of command would improve the direct control of the channel of Selby's system.

29. As to claim 57, Selby and Skarbo do not specifically disclose that the action is to set the agent status to ready or not ready. However, Selby disclosed his table is created and can be disabled/enabled depending on the attribute (col. 6 lines 16-18).

30. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have also included the status ready or not ready in Selby's and Skarbo's system because it would make it easier for their system to determine what step to take based on the agent's condition.

31. Claims 13, 17, 18, 34 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skarbo (5,805,886).

32. As to claim 13, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 1 above.

33. As to claim 17, it is rejected for the same reason as claims 1 and 5 above.

34. As to claim 18, it is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claims 1-2 above.

35. As to claim 34, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 3 above.

36. As to claim 35, Skarbo teaches:
an assignment module to determine an assignment of an agent to the work item (col. 5 lines 26-28).
37. Claims 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skarbo (5,805,886).
38. As to claims 19-21, they are rejected for the same reason as set forth in claims 1-2 above.
39. Claims 22-26, 37 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skarbo (5,805,886) as applied to claim 1 above.
40. As to claims 22, 36 and 37, they are database claims of claim 1 above, therefore they are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above. However, Skarbo does not explicitly disclose:
a communication channel table comprising information regarding a communication channel;
a channel driver table, comprising information regarding a channel driver that controls the operation of the communication channel and is operable to provide an event from the communication channel and to issue a command to the communication channel;
an event table comprising information regarding the event; and

Art Unit: 2126

a command table comprising information regarding the command.

41. However, Skarbo discloses an information file that contains the information needed to define and map events and commands to the plurality of communication channels via the plurality of channel drivers (108 Fig. 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a database to store the information in the information file of Skarbo because a database would offer structured and flexible storage of that information and allow the use of numerous third-party tools that exist to manage databases.

42. As to claims 23-26, Skarbo does not explicitly disclose that:
the communication channel table contains a channel ID, a media type, and a configuration ID;
the event table contains an event ID, an event name, and a channel driver ID;
the command table contains a command ID, a command name, and a channel driver ID; and
the channel driver table contains a channel driver ID, a media type, and a media string.

43. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to store in the information file database such information as an ID for each entity (serving as the primary key for that table), a descriptive name for each entry, the ID of an associated entry (serving as the foreign key to perform joins on the tables) because this is the minimum information needed to be stored in the database that would allow efficient functioning of the system of Skarbo.

44. As to claim 38, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 56 above.

Art Unit: 2126

45. Claims 39-42 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Selby (5,555,365).

46. As to claims 39-42, they are rejected for the same reason as claim 1 above.

47. As to claim 45, it is rejected for the same reason as claims 34 and 35 above.

48. Claims 43 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Selby (5,555,365) in view of Skarbo (5,805,886).

49. As to claims 43 and 44, they are rejected for the same reasons as claim 57 above.

50. Claims 46-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skarbo (5,805,886).

51. As to claims 46, 47, and 50-53, they are rejected for the same reason as claim 22 above.

52. As to claim 48, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 37 above.

53. As to claim 49, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 36 above.

Art Unit: 2126

54. Claims 59-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skarbo (5,805,886).

55. As to claims 59-61, they are rejected for the same reason as claim 1 above.

56. As to claims 62 and 63, they are rejected for the same reason as claim 8 above.

57. As to claims 64 and 66, they are rejected for the same reason as claim 22 above.

58. As to claim 65, Skarbo does not explicitly teach that the configuration determines whether the command is available to the user. However, the ability to determine whether a command is present or not is implied (202 Fig. 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include configuration information regarding the availability of a command because this allows the system to adapt to the absence of some of the communication channels and would also allow security to be implemented restricting the capabilities of certain users.

59. Claims 67-94 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skarbo (5,805,886).

60. As to claims 67-76, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1-10 above.

Art Unit: 2126

61. As to claims 77-83, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 27-33 above.

62. As to claim 84, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 13 above.


63. As to claims 85-94, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1-10 above.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edward Bross whose telephone number is 305-8754. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on 305-9678. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 308-5355.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 305-3900.

EB


MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100